

## REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the telephonic interview with the Examiner conducted on February 2, 2010 and the follow-up telephonic interview conducted on February 4, 2010. Prior to the interview on February 2, 2010, a summary of issues for discussion was provided to the Examiner, that summary containing essentially the same arguments put forth in this paper. Applicant has attempted to address the issues raised by the Examiner in both interviews.

Applicant has studied the Final Office Action dated November 12, 2009. Claims 1 and 11 are amended. Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

### § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al. ("Knudson" U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0273819) in view of Emura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,344,878). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to the problem caused by differences of base times between the channels of broadcast stations that provide broadcast programs due to technical reasons that causes the scheduled recording times of broadcasting programs on different channels to overlap with each other. See paragraphs 0007 and 0008 of application as originally filed.

It is noted that the present invention, as disclosed in independent claim 1 (with similar recitations in independent claim 11), recites correcting a scheduled recording time of at least the first broadcasting program or the second broadcasting program according to time correction data corresponding to a time difference between a first base time provided by the first channel and a second base time provided by the second channel. It is further noted that the Examiner makes no assertion in the Final Office Action that Knudson discloses this limitation.

It is noted that the Examiner asserts, in the Response to Argument at page 2 of the Final Office Action, that "Emura discloses time correction between two different

broadcasting programs” and “[e]ach broadcasting programs [has] a specific schedule base recording time and [accordingly] if one program overlaps another program, the television schedule information stored in the storing unit [is] renewed” at C. 19, ll. 42-65. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of the cited portion of Emura.

It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure at C. 19, ll. 42-65 of Emura is simply an alternative way of recording a first program and a second program when a program prior to the first program causes a delay of the first program. See Fig. 11A of Emura. It is further respectfully submitted that Emura is silent about a base time provided by a channel and time correction data corresponding to a time difference between base times provided by the channels. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Emura fails to even address any time error between channels, but rather is directed to the time error between the scheduled recording times of programs on different channels.

It is noted that the disclosure at C. 19, ll. 42-49 of Emura is “a first television program recording reservation for a first television program ‘drama’” is set for “10:00 to 11:00 of February 2” and a “second television program recording reservation for a second television program ‘music’” is set for “11:00 to 12:00 of February 2” and “do not overlap with each other.” It is further noted that the disclosure at C. 19, ll. 50-56 of Emura is “where a television program ‘baseball’ broadcasted just before the first television program is prolonged by 30 minutes, the television program schedule information ... is renewed” such that “a broadcasting time of the first television program is delayed by 30 minutes” and “the broadcasting time of the first television program overlaps with a broadcasting time of the second television program.”

It is respectfully submitted that the overlap between the “broadcasting time” of the “first television program” and the “second television program” disclosed in Emura is determined between only a corrected “broadcasting time” of “first television program” and the correction is due to the prolonged “broadcasting time” of a previous “television program” with no reference to any time difference between a first channel and a second channel as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, it is further respectfully

submitted that the disclosure at C. 19, ll. 42-65 of Emura is not analogous to correcting a scheduled recording time of at least the first broadcasting program or the second broadcasting program according to time correction data corresponding to a time difference between a first base time provided by the first channel and a second base time provided by the second channel, as recited in independent claim 1, or correcting a scheduled recording time of at least one broadcasting program scheduled to record according to the time correction data corresponding to time differences between the base times provided by the channels, as recited in independent claim 11.

Interview on February 2, 2010 and Follow-Up Interview on February 2, 2010

In the interview on February 2, 2010, the previous arguments were put forth to the Examiner. The Examiner asserted that the disclosure of the actual broadcast times of the “first television program” and the “second television program” at C. 19, ll. 42-65 of Emura read on the first base time provided by the first channel and second base time provided by the second channel recited in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagreed with the Examiner’s interpretation. In the follow-up interview on February 4, 2010, the Examiner requested that the claims be further amended to include details of the “time correction data corresponding to a time difference between a first base time provided by the first channel and a second base time provided by the second channel,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended with this paper to recite obtaining a first base time from a first channel and a second base time from a second channel, the first base time representing a time of day at a first broadcast station that provides a first broadcasting program on the first channel and the second base time representing a time of day at a second broadcast station that provides a second broadcasting program on the first channel, with support for the amendments found in the application as originally filed at at least paragraphs 0048-0050, 0054-0056 and 0080-0085. It is respectfully submitted that Emura cannot be asserted as disclosing this limitation since Emura contains no disclosure related to a first broadcast station that provides the “first television program” and a second broadcast station that provides the “second television program.”

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-15 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as originally filed, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY

Date: February 11, 2010

By: /Richard C. Salfelder/  
Richard C. Salfelder  
Registration No. 51,127  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884